



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,608	12/31/2003	David C. Hastings	066243-0267 (146044)	8938
7590	10/06/2008	Joseph D. Kuborn Andrus, Sceales, Starke & Sawall 100 East Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 1100 Milwaukee, WI 53202	EXAMINER MONIKANG, GEORGE C	
			ART UNIT 2614	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/06/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/750,608	HASTINGS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	GEORGE C. MONIKANG	2615	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 July 2008.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/2/2004</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2615

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. Claims 1-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

StatView RespondNow, 2002, GE, USA, in view of Brown, US Patent 5,997,476.

Re Claim 1, StatView RespondNow discloses a medical monitoring health care facility , the system comprising: a patient monitoring devices, the patient monitoring devices configured to send an alert to the medical monitoring system through a hospital network when any of a plurality of patients being monitored may have a condition that requires attention (*Instant knowledge for better care*), the medical monitoring system configured to generate a notification message when the patient monitoring device sends the alert (*Instant knowledge for better care*), the medical monitoring system includes a notification server that converts the alert to an appropriate format and a notification transmitter that receives the alert and wirelessly transfers the notification message to a portable electronic device (*Instant knowledge for better care*), a processing circuit configured to receive the notification messages indicating that the patient being monitored may have a condition that requires attention (*Instant knowledge for better care: its inherent that the device in fig. 1 has a processing circuit*); a wireless transceiver (*fig. 2 of page 2*); and to facilitate transfer of data by way of the wireless transceiver

(*Instant knowledge for better care*), wherein the portable electronic device is adapted to communicate via a plurality of wireless protocols, corresponding to the patient monitoring device (*fig. 2*); but fails to disclose wherein the portable electronic device includes: an audio signal input device (*Brown, fig. 15: 118; col. 12, lines 12-14*); an audio signal output device (*Brown, fig. 15: 72; col. 12, lines 6-11*) and the data being a voice data (*Brown, col. 11, lines 46-55*). However, Brown does.

Taking the combined teachings of StatView RespondNow, 2002 and Brown as a whole, one skilled in the art would have found it obvious to modify the medical medical monitoring health care facility , the system comprising: a patient monitoring devices, the patient monitoring devices configured to send an alert to the medical monitoring system through a hospital network when any of a plurality of patients being monitored may have a condition that requires attention (*Instant knowledge for better care*), the medical monitoring system configured to generate a notification message when the patient monitoring device sends the alert (*Instant knowledge for better care*), the medical monitoring system includes a notification server that converts the alert to an appropriate format and a notification transmitter that receives the alert and wirelessly transfers the notification message to a portable electronic device (*Instant knowledge for better care*), a processing circuit configured to receive the notification messages indicating that the patient being monitored may have a condition that requires attention (*Instant knowledge for better care: its inherent that the device in fig. 1 has a processing circuit*); a wireless transceiver (*fig. 2 of page 2*); and to facilitate transfer of data by way of the wirelessly (*Instant knowledge for better care*), wherein the portable

electronic device is adapted to communicate via a plurality of wireless protocols, corresponding to the patient monitoring device (*fig. 2*) of StatView RespondNow, 2002 with wherein the portable electronic device includes: an audio signal input device (*Brown, fig. 15: 118; col. 12, lines 12-14*); an audio signal output device (*Brown, fig. 15: 72; col. 12, lines 6-11*) and the data being a voice data (*Brown, col. 11, lines 46-55*) as taught in Brown to provide personal medical conditions of patients and audibly communicate queries.

The combined teachings of StatView RespondNow, 2002 and Brown fail to explicitly disclose the transfer of data carried out by a transceiver and a plurality of patient monitoring devices. Official notice is taken that both the concepts and advantages of the transfer of data carried out by a transceiver and using a plurality of patient monitoring devices are well known in the art. Thus it would have been obvious to transfer data using a transceiver since transceivers are commonly used in wireless signal communications and using a plurality of patient monitoring devices so the caregivers can monitor the condition of many patients thus making the caregiver more efficient.

Claim 2 has been analyzed and rejected according to claim 1.

Re Claim 3, the combined teachings of StatView RespondNow, 2002 and Brown disclose the portable electronic device of claim 1, wherein the wireless transceiver uses a cellular data protocol (*Brown, col. 4, lines 55-60*).

Re Claim 4, the combined teachings of StatView RespondNow, 2002 and Brown disclose the portable electronic device of claim 1, wherein the device is configured such

that if a voice communication link is established with a recipient while a notification message is being displayed, data associated with the notification message may be forwarded to the recipient (*Brown, col. 11, lines 46-55*).

Re Claim 5, the combined teachings of StatView RespondNow, 2002 and Brown disclose the portable electronic device of claim 4, wherein the device is configured such that if a voice communication link is established with a recipient while a notification message is received, data associated with the notification message is automatically forwarded to the recipient (*Brown, col. 11, lines 46-55*).

Re Claim 6, the combined teachings of StatView RespondNow, 2002 and Brown disclose the portable electronic device of claim 1, wherein the transceiver is capable of transferring data to an access point connected to a health care facility network (*StatView RespondNow, 2002, fig. 2*).

Re Claim 7, the combined teachings of StatView RespondNow, 2002 and Brown disclose the portable electronic device of claim 1, wherein the transceiver is configured such that a user may connect directly with a second portable electronic device (*Brown, fig. 1: 24 & 32*).

Claims 8 & 10 have been analyzed and rejected according to claim 1.

Claim 9 has been analyzed and rejected according to claims 3 & 8.

Claim 11 has been analyzed and rejected according to claim 1.

Re Claim 12, the combined teachings of StatView RespondNow, 2002 and Brown disclose the system of claim 11, wherein the second processing circuit is

configured to facilitate transfer of the voice data to a recipient using a telephone line
(Brown, col. 4, lines 55-60).

Re Claim 13, which further recites, “Wherein the processing circuit is configured to use a private branch exchange to facilitate transfer of the voice data to a recipient using the telephone line.” The combined teachings of StatView RespondNow, 2002 and Brown do not explicitly disclose a private branch exchange as claimed. Official notice is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing a private branch exchange is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to use a private branch exchange since it is commonly used as a communication means to serve a particular office or organization.

Re Claim 14, the combined teachings of StatView RespondNow, 2002 and Brown disclose the system of claim 11, wherein the second processing circuit is coupled to the portable electronic device using a network of the health care facility *(Brown, fig. 1: 24 & 32).*

Re Claim 15, the combined teachings of StatView RespondNow, 2002 and Brown disclose the system of claim 11, wherein the second processing circuit is configured to receive a user input signal input by the audio signal input device and initiate a call to a particular recipient based on the audible user input signal *(Brown, fig. 15: 118; col. 12, lines 12-14; Brown, col. 4, lines 55-60).*

Claim 16 has been analyzed according to claims 3 & 11.

Re Claim 17, the combined teachings StatView RespondNow, 2002 and Brown disclose the system of claim 11, further comprising a second portable electronic device

(StatView RespondNow, 2002, RespondNow improves care quality: ability to let another caregiver respond means there are multiple caregivers using RespondNow), comprising a second audio signal input device (StatView RespondNow, 2002, RespondNow improves care quality: ability to let another caregiver respond means there are multiple caregivers using RespondNow); a second signal output device (StatView RespondNow, 2002, RespondNow improves care quality: ability to let another caregiver respond means there are multiple caregivers using RespondNow); a second wireless communicator (StatView RespondNow, 2002, RespondNow improves care quality: ability to let another caregiver respond means there are multiple caregivers using RespondNow); and a third processing circuit configured (StatView RespondNow, 2002, RespondNow, Instant knowledge for better care: its inherent that the device in fig. 1 has a processing circuit) to receive the notification messages indicating that the patient being monitored may have a condition that requires attention and to facilitate transfer of voice data to the second audio signal output and from the second audio signal input wirelessly (StatView RespondNow, 2002, RespondNow improves care quality: ability to let another caregiver respond means there are multiple caregivers using RespondNow); wherein the portable electronic device is configured to transfer voice data from the first electronic device directly to the second electronic device (Brown, col. 4, lines 55-60).

Re Claim 18, the combined teachings of StatView RespondNow, 2002 and Brown disclose the system of claim 11, wherein one of the first processing circuit and the second processing circuit is configured to initiate a call to a particular recipient

based on a notification message received by the portable electronic device (Brown, fig. 15: 118; col. 12, lines 12-14; Brown, col. 4, lines 55-60).

Claim 19 has been analyzed and rejected according to claims 4 & 11.

Claim 20 has been analyzed and rejected according to claims 3 & 11.

Re Claim 21, the combined teachings of StatView RespondNow, 2002 and Brown disclose the system of claim 11, wherein a single user input received by one of a user input device of the portable electronic device and a device used by the recipient of the voice data may be used to forward, to the recipient of the voice data, physiologic data that has been received by the portable electronic device (StatView RespondNow, 2002, Instant knowledge for better care).

Re Claim 22, the combined teachings of StatView RespondNow, 2002 and Brown disclose the system of claim 21, wherein the single user input may be used to forward data that is displayed on a display screen of the portable electronic device and data that is related to the data that is displayed on a display screen of the portable electronic device (StatView RespondNow, 2002, Instant knowledge for better care).

Re Claim 23, the combined teachings of StatView RespondNow, 2002 and Brown disclose wherein the system is configured such that the portable electronic device may be used to control a wireless phone (Brown, fig. 1: 26/32) coupled to the portable electronic device and answer incoming calls of the wireless phone (Brown, col. 4, lines 55-59).

Re Claim 24, the combined teachings of StatView RespondNow, 2002 and Brown disclose the system of claim 11, wherein a notification message received by the

first processing circuit includes physiological data associated with the patient who may have a condition that requires attention (StatView RespondNow, 2002, Instant knowledge for better care).

Claim 25 has been analyzed and rejected according to claims 1 & 21.

Claim 26 has been analyzed and rejected according to claims 1 & 21.

Re Claim 27, the combined teachings of Albert et al, ABI and Brown disclose the method of claim 26, wherein the physiologic data is ECG waveform data (StatView RespondNow, 2002, RespondNow improves care quality).

Re Claim 28, the combined teachings of StatView RespondNow, 2002 and Brown disclose the method of claim 25, wherein receiving data from a monitoring device comprises receiving data from a central station that has received the data from the monitoring device (StatView RespondNow, 2002, fig. 2).

Claim 29 has been analyzed and rejected according to claims 1 & 21.

Claims 30 & 33 have been analyzed and rejected according to claims 1 & 21.

Claim 31 has been analyzed and rejected according to claims 1, 3 & 21.

Claim 32 has been analyzed and rejected according to claims 1, 3 & 21.

Claim 34 has been analyzed and rejected according to claims 1, 17 & 21.

Claim 35 has been analyzed and rejected according to claims 1, 4, 21 & 25.

Claim 36 has been analyzed and rejected according to claims 1, 21-22.

Claim 37 has been analyzed and rejected according to claims 1, 15 & 21.

Re Claim 38, the combined teachings of StatView RespondNow, 2002 and Brown disclose the method of claim 25, but fail to disclose further comprising

transferring voice data using a wired connection to the portable electronic device.

However official notice is taken that both the concepts and advantages of providing a wired connection are well known in the art. Thus it would have been obvious to use a wired connection for the purpose of establishing a stronger connection.

Claim 39 has been analyzed and rejected according to claims 1 & 21.

Claim 40 has been analyzed and rejected according to claims 3, 11, 14, 17 & 21.

Claims 41 & 42 have been analyzed and rejected according to claims 3, 11, 14, 17 & 21.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to GEORGE C. MONIKANG whose telephone number is (571)270-1190. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F. alt Fri. Off 7:30am-5:00pm (est).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chin Vivian can be reached on 571-272-7848. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/George C Monikang/
Examiner, Art Unit 2615

9/30/2008

/Vivian Chin/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2615